UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/562,053	08/08/2006	Florence Clement	1022702-000150	6174
	7590 07/30/200 INGERSOLL & ROO	EXAMINER		
POST OFFICE	BOX 1404	DOLLINGER, MICHAEL M		
ALEXANDKIA	A, VA 22313-1404	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1796		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/30/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/562,053	CLEMENT ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	MIKE DOLLINGER	1796					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 July 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
	liance with 27 CED 41 27 must be f	ilad within two month	o of the data of				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
AMENDMENTS		-20 (b (1 b					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	21 See attached Notice of Non Co.	maliant Amandment (DTOL 224)				
_		IIIpiiant Amendment (F10L-324).				
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 							
 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: 		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>25-48</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Randy Gulakowski/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796							
Ouporvisory raterit Examiner, Art Offic 1730							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amendments to claim 25 and Applicants' arguments directed to the rejection of Schueler et al do not overcome the rejection. AT LEAST the rejection wherein the melamine cyanurate of Schueler reads on the first additive (i) of the claims. Applicants argue that the their disclosure indicates that the first additive can partially or completely react with the polyamide and/or polyester matrix and by comparision there is no indication by Schueler that the melamine cyanurate is capable of partially or completely reacting with a polyamide and/or polyester matrix. This argument is not convincing for two reasons. First, the reactivity of the first additive with the polyamide and/or polyester matrix is not a requirement of the claims and therefore not relevant to patentability of the instant claims. Second, even if the claims were amended to include this limitation it would be met by the melamine cyanurate; the melamine cyanurate includes multiple amine groups which would be reactive with the carboxylic acid terminal groups of the polyamide or polyester matrix.